



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 10, 2003

Mr. Martin J. Placke  
City Attorney  
City of Giddings  
118 E. Richmond Street  
Giddings, Texas 78942

OR2003-7198

Dear Mr. Placke:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 189246.

The City of Giddings (the "city") received a request for the employment application of a named individual. You state that the city has released a portion of the requested information to the requestor. However, you claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.115, 552.117, 552.119, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, which makes a declaration of psychological and emotional health confidential, provides in part:

(a) The commission may not issue a license to a person as an officer or county jailer unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought . . . .

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license as an officer or county jailer is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each

declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to the commission. *A declaration is not public information.*

Occ. Code § 1701.306 (emphasis added). Therefore, we agree that the submitted declaration of psychological and emotional health is made confidential by section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.102 of the Government Code protects “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” The protection of section 552.102 is the same as the protection provided by the common-law right to privacy under section 552.101. *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.--Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.). Consequently, we will consider these two exceptions together.

Information is protected under the common-law right to privacy when (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Prior decisions of this office have found that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure). In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990), 523 (1989) (individual’s mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), certain personal choices relating to financial transactions between the individual and the governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). Having reviewed the submitted information, we conclude that portions of the information, which we have marked, are protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, we conclude that

none of the remaining information is protected by common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute his private affairs), 444 (1986) (public has interest in public employee's qualifications and performance and circumstances of his resignation or termination), 405 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs his job); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Next, you assert that the submitted birth certificate is excepted under section 552.115 of the Government Code. Birth or death records maintained by the bureau of vital statistics of the Texas Department of Health or a local registration official are excepted from required public disclosure under section 552.115. However, because the city is not the bureau of vital statistics or a local registration official, a birth certificate held by the city may not be withheld under section 552.115.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, or social security number" of a peace officer, or that reveals whether the peace officer has family members. We note that a former or future spouse does not constitute a family member for purposes of section 552.117(a)(2). Further, we note that an individual's personal post office box number is not a "home address" and therefore may not be withheld under section 552.117. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117; Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) ("The legislative history of section 552.117(1)(A) makes clear that its purpose is to protect public employees from being harassed *at home*. *See* House Committee on State Affairs, Bill Analysis, H.B. 1976, 69th Leg. (1985); Senate Committee on State Affairs, Bill Analysis, H.B. 1976, 69th Leg. (1985)." (Emphasis added.)); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express and cannot be implied), 478 at 2 (1987) (language of confidentiality statute controls scope of protection), 465 at 4-5 (1987) (statute explicitly required confidentiality). Therefore, we agree that the city must withhold most of the information you have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code, as well as the additional information we have marked. However, we have marked the information that is not subject to this section and must be released.

Additionally, you assert section 552.119 of the Government Code. That section excepts from public disclosure a photograph of a peace officer<sup>1</sup> that, if released, would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer unless one of three exceptions applies. The three exceptions are: (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information; (2) the officer is a party in a fire or police civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; or (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding. This section also provides that a photograph exempt from disclosure under this section may be made public only if the peace officer gives written consent to the disclosure. Open Records Decision No. 502 (1988). The

---

<sup>1</sup>"Peace officer" is defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

submitted information includes a photograph depicting a peace officer, and it does not appear that any of the exceptions are applicable. You state that the peace officer in question has not executed any written consent to disclosure. Thus, you must withhold the submitted photograph under section 552.119.

Finally, section 552.130 of the Government Code prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See Gov't Code* § 552.130. Accordingly, we agree that the city must withhold the section 552.130 information you have marked.

In summary, we conclude that the city must withhold: 1) the declaration of psychological and emotional health under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code; 2) the information we have marked under common-law privacy; and 3) the section 552.117, 552.119, and 552.130 information. All remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. *Gov't Code* § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 189246

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Mary Tello  
P.O. Box 181  
Giddings, Texas 78942  
(w/o enclosures)